

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the reasons that follow.

Claims 1, 2 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,717,705 to Shikakura et al. (hereinafter “Shikakura”). Claims 3, 4 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shikakura in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,377,580 to Matsumoto et al. (hereinafter “Matsumoto”).

A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier. Claims 1-6 remain pending in this application for consideration.

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are patentably distinguishable over the cited references as required by §§ 102 and 103. Applicant further submits that none of the cited references, whether considered alone or in combination, discloses Applicant’s claimed image processing apparatus including: (1) *a code separation section which separates the image data encoded by the compression processing section into at least two separate encoded image data in accordance with a separation scheme set* and (2) *a key information preparation section which generates information indicating the separation scheme set which represents the locations of the separate storage regions* as required by independent claim 1. By contrast, the cited references fail to disclose, teach or suggest these claimed features. Accordingly, independent claim 1 and claims dependent therefrom are patentably distinguishable over the cited references. This distinction will be further described below.

THE CLAIMS DISTINGUISH OVER THE CITED REFERENCES

Claims 1, 2 and 5 stand rejected as being anticipated by Shikakura. In response, Applicant traverses the rejection and respectfully submits that the claims are allowable at least for the reasons that follow.

Applicant relies on MPEP § 2131, entitled “Anticipation – Application of 35 U.S.C. 102(a), (b), and (e),” which states that a “claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” Section 103 amplifies the meaning of this anticipation standard by pointing out that anticipation requires that the claimed subject matter must be “*identically* disclosed or described” by the prior art reference. (Emphasis added.) It is respectfully submitted that Shikakura does not describe each and every element of any of the claims.

Embodiments of the present invention relate to an image processing apparatus. The image processing apparatus includes a compression section, first, second and third storage sections, a code separation section, a key information preparation section, a code synthesis section and an extension processing section. The compression processing section compresses and encodes image data to form encoded image data which is stored in the first storage section. The second storage section includes at least two separate storage regions for storing the separated encoded image data and the third storage section stores the key information, with the third storage section being separated from the second storage section. The code synthesis section synthesizes the separated encoded image data stored in the second storage section for reproducing the encoded image data, in accordance with the key information stored in the third storage section and the extension processing section extends the compressed and encoded image data synthesized by the code synthesis section to reproduce the image data.

According to one embodiment of the present invention as recited in independent claim 1, ***the code separation section separates the image data encoded by the compression processing section into at least two separate encoded image data in accordance with a separation scheme set.*** This means that the code separation section is provided in the latter stage of the compression section. Also, according to one embodiment of the present invention, ***the key information preparation section generates information indicating the separation scheme set which represents the locations of the separate storage regions.*** In the present invention, the key information is generated for indicating locations of the separate storage regions of the second storage section. With these features and arrangements the image data stored in the image processing apparatus is prevented from being restored by an

unauthorized third party (*see*, page 1, line 21 through page 2, line 8). One exemplary embodiment of the present invention is illustrated in FIG. 1, which shows page memory 6 that stores encoded data from the compression processing section 4 (the first storage section), banks B0 and B1 of the hard disk drive section 8 that store components of the encoded data separated by the code separation section 7a (the second storage section), and random access memory in the system control section 5 that stores the key information (the third storage section which is separated from the second storage section) (page 7, lines 23-27, page 8, lines 13-20 and page 9, lines 7-9). Applicant respectfully submits that the cited reference fails to disclose these claimed features and arrangements as well as the benefits provided.

Shikakura discloses an image processing apparatus having a receiving device, an error detecting device, a correcting device and a decoding device (Abstract, lines 1-8). The decoding device has the function of expanding compressed image data (column 1, lines 10-12). Shikakura's image processing apparatus satisfactorily controls the amount of compressed data and prevents deterioration of image quality even if an error occurs on a transmission path (Abstract, lines 8-12). Shikakura discloses that the transmission path 403 can be in the form of a storage medium (column 5, lines 26-36) and discloses several frame memories (35, 226, 228, 233, 235, etc.) that store processed image data.

As illustrated in FIG. 1, Shikakura discloses encoding the DC and AC components of a video signal with encoding circuits 408 and 409 respectively, which compresses the amount of information (column 5, lines 36-51). According to the circuit shown in FIG. 1 of Shikakura, the encoded DC and AC signals processed by the orthogonal transformation 407 before being encoded. Thus according to Shikakura's system, code separation section is not provided in the latter stage of the compression processing as in the present invention but is provided in the former stage of the compression processing section (*see*, encoding circuits 408 and 409 and column 5, lines 49-51). Therefore, Shikakura fails to disclose *the code separation section separates the image data encoded by the compression processing section into at least two separate encoded image data in accordance with a separation scheme set as required by the claim*. This shortcoming of Shikakura defines at least one patentable deficiency in the reference.

In addition, Shikakura's synch signal fails to qualify as the claimed key information. Shikakura teaches no more than a technique for adding the synch signal to the synthesized data in the synch signal addition circuit 413. The synch signal is detected by a synch signal detecting circuit 101 for carrying out a particular signal processing. In other words, the synch signal of Shikakura is not used as key information for indicating the location of separate storage regions of the storage section but instead is used for performing a signal processing function in a signal synchronous manner (column 5, line 60 through column 6, line 3). Thus, the function of the claimed key information is totally different from Shikakura's synch signal. Therefore, Shikakura fails to disclose *the key information preparation section generates information indicating the separation scheme set which represents the locations of the separate storage regions* as required by the claim. This shortcoming of Shikakura defines at least another patentable deficiency in the reference. For anticipation, however, "every element and limitation of the claimed invention must be found in a single prior art reference, arranged as in the claim." *Brown v. 3M*, 60 USPQ2d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2001). Shikakura fails to disclose each of the features of independent claim 1

The Matsumoto reference was relied upon to address various features recited in some of the dependent claims. Applicant respectfully submits that the Matsumoto reference fails to disclose, teach or suggest the features identified above and was not cited for that purpose. Thus, the Matsumoto reference fails to cure the deficiencies of Shikakura.

In view of the fact that the Shikakura reference does not disclose each of the claimed features and arrangements indicated above, this reference cannot be said to anticipate nor can it be said to render obvious the invention which is the subject matter of independent claim 1. Thus, independent claim 1 is allowable.

Since independent claim 1 is allowable, claims dependent therefrom, namely claims 2-6 are also allowable by virtue of their direct or indirect dependence from allowable independent claim 1 and for containing other patentable features. Further remarks regarding the asserted relationship between any of the claims and the cited reference are not necessary in view of their allowability. Applicant's silence as to the Office Action's comments is not indicative of being in acquiescence to the stated grounds of rejection.

CONCLUSION

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing or a credit card payment form being unsigned, providing incorrect information resulting in a rejected credit card transaction, or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date September 15, 2008

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 945-6162
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

By Thomas S. Bilodeau ^{Reg. No. 43,438}

/s/ Pavan K. Agarwal
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 40,888